



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,953	09/10/2003	Alexander Karl Huwig	20959/21409 (P63469)	3518
96448	7590	10/12/2010	EXAMINER	
Ivoclar Vivadent Inc. 175 Pineview Drive Amherst, NY 14228			FUBARA, BLESSING M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1613	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/12/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ann.knab@ivoclarvivadent.com
Dominica.LaRusch@ivoclarvivadent.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/658,953	Applicant(s) HUWIG ET AL.	
	Examiner BLESSING M. FUBARA	Art Unit 1613	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-10, 13 and 21-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17-20, 27, 33 and 35-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1, 2, 6-8, 11-15, 17-27, 33, 35-43 (1, 2 and 4-15, 17-27 and 33-43 .

DETAILED ACTION

1. The examiner acknowledges receipt of request for extension of time, request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, amendment and remarks filed 7/27/2010; examiner also acknowledges receipt of power of attorney filed 7/15/2010. Claims 1, 2, 6-8 and 33 are amended. Claims 4, 5, 9, 10 and 34 are canceled. Thus, claims 1, 2, 6-8, 11-15, 17-27, 33, 35-43 (1, 2 and 4-15, 17-27 and 33-43 are pending. Claims 6-10, 13 and 21-26 are withdrawn from consideration; claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17-20, 27, 33 and 35-43 are under examination.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/27/2010 has been entered.

3. Claims 6 has been withdrawn from consideration. Thus the status identifier for claim 6 should have been, ---withdrawn, currently amended---. It is suggested that the appropriate status identifiers be used for the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17-20, 27, 33 and 35-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes et al. (US 6,004,538) in view of Asano et al. (US 4,568,540) .

7. Hughes discloses liquid dentifrice and mouthwash compositions that comprise one or more of oral composition components that are selected from abrasives, binders such as xanthan gum and carboxymethylcellulose at 0.1-5%, humectants, surfactants, fluoride ion sources, anticalculus agents and sweeteners and additionally comprises dimethicone copolyol selected from alkyl- and alkoxy-dimethicone copolyols (abstract; column 5, lines 30-35, 52-65); may also include lipophilic flavorants and lipophilic antimicrobial compounds (column 4, lines 29-62). Silica gels or xerogels (column 6, line 10) or calcium carbonate (column 6, lines 22 and 23) are abrasive agents. The composition of Hughes may also contain surfactants (column 6, lines 34-48), soluble fluoride ions such as sodium fluoride, stannous fluoride (column 6, lines 49-55), anti-calculus agents, of which specific example is zinc compounds (column 6, line 59 to column 7 line 22), sweetening and flavoring agents at 0.005 to about 2% and humectants (column 7, lines 23-26, 43), bleaching agent (column 7, line 52 to column 8, line 45), optional agents such

Art Unit: 1613

as dyes/colorant, pH adjusting agents, plant extracts and desensitizing agents such as potassium nitrate, and mixtures thereof (column 7, lines 27-41), and effervescent agents such as carbonate that are effective under acidic conditions and mixed with organic acids such as citric acid, malic acid, succinic acid and gluconic acid (column 8, lines 13-23). The composition may also contain polyethylene glycols (column 10, lines 60 and 61) and phosphonic acid chelating agents at 0.1-1% (column 12, line 16); and the composition contains from about 0-60% or 5-30% ethanol when it is a mouthwash (column 7, line 45) meeting claims 20 and 42. The xanthan gum and polyethylene glycol meet the limitation of polymer in claims 1, 12 and 36. The presence of phosphonic acid, citric acid meets the acid requirements of claims 1, 11 and 35. The fluoride ions meet the requirements of claims 14 and 37; potassium nitrate is a source of potassium ion meeting claims 15 and 38; carboxymethylcellulose meets the film-forming agent of claim 1; the sweetening agent at 0.005 to about 2% meets claims 19 and 41. Applying the composition containing desensitizing agent meets claim 27 and the composition of Hughes meets claims 18 and 40. The solubility of the acid recited in claims 2 and 33 is a property of the acid so that the acid of Hughes, which is the same phosphonic acid as in the claims, would have those properties and thus meet claims 2 and 33. Regarding claims 17 and 39, one film-forming agent may replace another without negatively affecting the composition. In this case, hydroxypropyl cellulose could be substituted for carboxymethyl cellulose with the expectation that the composition would be effective as a dentifrice.

8. Hughes discloses the claimed composition as described above. The difference between the Hughes composition and the claimed composition is that while Hughes teaches that the composition can be acidic, Hughes does not specifically teach a pH of from 1.5 to 3. However,

Art Unit: 1613

Asano describes dentifrice composition containing fluoride ion from potassium or sodium fluoride at 0.0025 to 4%, zinc ions, polyethylene glycol, hydroxyl ethyl cellulose, silica abrasive, xanthan gum or carrageenan at 0.2 to 5%, humectants, succinic acid or gluconic acid or maleic acid or fumaric acid as buffering agents; 0.01 to 2% flavoring agent/sweetening; ethanol/water solvent; Asano specifically teaches that the pH of the composition should be maintained at acidic pH of 3.5 to 6 in order to permit the fluoride to remain in solution instead of precipitating (abstract; column 2, line 39- 55; column 3, lines 7-59, column 4, lines 2, 11-14, 17-37; column 5, lines 30-43; Example 8 and claims 1-11). The pH for the composition of claim 43 is the same as that of the generic claim 1 so that once the pH of the composition in 1 is rendered obvious then the pH of claim 43 would also be rendered obvious.

9. Hughes contemplates using the composition at acidic pH. Asano specifically teaches that pH of 3.5 to 6 is suggested dentifrice composition to permit the fluoride to remain in solution. Thus, pHs of dentifrices or mouth washes are result effective parameters. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the pH of the composition of Hughes according to the teachings of Asano to maintain the pH at acidic pHs of 3.5 to 6 or lower in order to maintain the fluoride in solution. Thus, when Hughes in view of Asano are taken together, the ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to maintain the pH of the composition at acidic pH in order that the fluoride can be maintained in solution as a low pH is expected to maintain the fluoride and zinc ions in solution.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 7/27/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 1613

11. Applicant argues that the claims as amended are in condition for allowance because the pH of the claimed composition is from 2 to 3 and that the proposed combination of Hughes and Asano would not render the invention obvious.

12. Response: The proposed combination of Hughes and Asano would render the invention obvious because the proposed combination would produce composition that would have a pH of 3 to 6 and because the pH of the composition is result effective, the pH would be optimized to optimum effective composition in which the fluoride is maintained in solution. Further, the applicant has not shown that a pH of 3 provide unexpected results over a pH of 3.5.

13. “Compositions in the form of toothpastes, denture cleansing liquids and pastes and the like will generally comprise a binder or thickening agent.” These lines do not say that each of the listed components is not compatible with each of the compositions.

14. “Denture cleanser compositions of the invention can additionally include one or more bleaching agents, organic peroxyacid precursors, effervescence generators, chelating agents, etc” does not say that says that the components listed for the composition in Hughes are not compatible with each of the compositions. In fact, in a preceding section at column 5, lines 52, 53 and lines 47-50 identifies denture cleansing compositions as liquids.

15. No claim is allowed.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BLESSING M. FUBARA whose telephone number is (571)272-0594. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

Art Unit: 1613

17. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Y. Kwon can be reached on (571) 272-0581. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

18. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Blessing M. Fubara/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1613